

REMARKS

Introduction

Upon entry of the foregoing response, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-14, and 16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-14, and 16 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0165056 to Komaki (hereinafter "Komaki") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0051170 to Spearman (hereinafter "Spearman").

The cited combination of these references does not render Applicant's claimed invention unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), because the cited combination does not suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention the subject matter recited by the respective claims, as amended, for the following reasons. Furthermore, in view of the amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Komaki is generally directed to a system and method where a plurality of network terminal devices 2a-2e, which are configured as internet phones (IP phones), communicate with each other to place a voice communication (i.e., an internet telephone call) via a network 1 which is connected to the IP phones and to an internet service provider (ISP) which includes a DNS server 3 and a DHCP server 4. (See, Figure 1 and paragraphs. [0010]-[0027] of Komaki) When manufactured, the IP phones 2a-d are each provided a unique MAC address for each of the IP phones 2a-d which are respectively stored in the address table 16a of each IP phone. (See, Figures 2a and 2b, and paragraphs. [0027] and [0032]-[0036] of Komaki) The address table 16a of each IP phone includes a MAC address or an IP address of each of the IP phones in the network, as well as an IP addresses of the DNS Server 3, the DHCP Server 4 and/or the

Address management server 5.

In operation, an IP phone placing a communication call can make an inquiry to the address management server 5, using a MAC address or a domain name, for an IP address of a remote IP phone to which the call is being placed. (See, Figures 2a and 2b, and paragraph [0033]-[0036] of Komaki) The calling IP phone can communicate with the remote IP phone once the MAC address or domain name of the remote IP phone has been converted to an IP address assigned to the remote IP phone by the DHCP server 4, via the address management server 5, and provided to address table 16a of the calling IP phone. Likewise, the remote IP phone has the IP address of the calling IP phone provided to its address table 16a so it knows where it sends its reply to the calling IP phone. (Id.)

Although the the DHCP server 4 of Komaki may assign an IP address to an IP phone, the IP phone is certainly not the equivalent of a remote management processor which is coupled to a remote hardware server to perform management functions thereon. That is, Komaki does not disclose "configuring an IP address issuing computer to include a plurality of IP addresses that are available and authorized to be assigned to at least one remote management processor which is coupled to a remote hardware server to perform management functions thereon," as currently recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Additionally, the IP phone calling operation of Komaki, described above and in Komaki as cited above, is not the equivalent of the method of amended claim 1, which includes all of the following features:

- configuring an IP address issuing computer to include a plurality of IP addresses that are available and authorized to be assigned to at least one remote management processor which is coupled to a remote hardware server to perform management functions thereon, and to include Option data associated with the at least one remote management processor, such that the Option data comprises an IP address of a management server which is configured to communicate via a network with the at least one remote management processor to access information about hardware resources disposed within the remote hardware server coupled to the at least one remote management processor;

- sending a request from the at least one remote management processor to the IP address issuing computer for an IP address to be assigned to the at least one remote management processor;

- in response to the request, receiving from the IP issuing computer, at the at least one remote management processor, an acknowledgement packet which includes the requested IP address assigned to the at least one remote management processor and the Option data;

- in response to receiving the acknowledgment packet, executing a local code in the at least one remote management processor such that the local code searches the acknowledgement packet to detect the Option data, and storing in the remote management

processor, as a destination address for sending an alert packet, the received IP address of the management server included in the Option data; and

in response to the detecting of the Option data, automatically sending the alert packet to the destination address by the at least one remote management processor, such that the alert packet includes the received requested IP address of the at least one remote management processor.

Spearman was cited by the Examiner for the sole purpose of providing an alleged equivalent of a previously recited feature of claim 1, which feature has been removed from claim 1 by the amendment of claim 1 herein. Furthermore, Spearman does not overcome all of the deficiencies of Komaki, described above, nor was Spearman cited by the Examiner for that purpose.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, the cited references, separately or in combination, do not disclose or make obvious the currently recited features of the method of claim 1, as amended. Thus, amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Komaki and Spearman, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 7

Independent claim 7 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. For at least the reasons given above in regard to amended independent claim 1, neither Komaki nor Spearman, separately or in combination, discloses or renders obvious, a system for providing an address of at least one remote management processor to a management server, including all of the following features as currently recited:

- a management server;

- at least one remote management processor configured to be connected to the management server through a network, wherein the at least one remote management processor is coupled to a remote hardware server to perform management functions thereon, and wherein the management server is configured to communicate via the network with the at least one remote management processor to access information about hardware resources disposed within the remote hardware server coupled to the at least one remote management processor;

- an IP address issuing computer connected to the at least one remote management processor through the network, wherein

- the IP address issuing computer is configured to include a plurality of IP addresses that are available and authorized to be assigned to the at least one remote management processor, and to include Option data which is associated with the at least one remote management processor and includes an IP address of the management

server;

the at least one remote management processor sends a request to the IP address issuing computer for an IP address to be assigned to the at least one management processor;

the IP address issuing computer assigns an IP address to the at least one remote management processor in response to the request and sends an acknowledgment packet to the at least one remote management processor which includes the assigned IP address and the Option data;

the at least one remote management processor receives the acknowledgement packet;

a local code in the at least one remote management processor searches the acknowledgement packet to detect the Option data and stores in the at least one remote management processor, as a destination address for sending an alert packet, the received IP address of the management server included in the Option data; and

in response to the detecting of the Option data, automatically sending the alert packet to the destination address by the at least one remote management processor to enable the communication between the management server and the at least one management processor via the network.

Therefore, amended claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over Komaki and Spearman, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 7 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 12

Independent claim 12 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. For at least the reasons given above in regard to amended independent claim 1, neither Komaki nor Spearman, separately or in combination, discloses or renders obvious, a computer program product for providing an internet protocol (IP) address of at least one remote management processor to a management server, including program code that when executed by a computer includes all of the following functionality, as currently recited:

configuring an IP address issuing computer to include a plurality of IP addresses that are available and authorized to be assigned to at least one remote management processor which is coupled to a remote hardware server to perform management functions thereon, and to include Option data associated with the at least one remote management processor, such that the Option data comprises an IP address of a management server which is configured to communicate via a network with the at least one remote management processor to access information about hardware resources disposed within the remote hardware server coupled to the at least one remote management processor;

sending a request from the at least one remote management processor to the IP address

issuing computer for an IP address to be assigned to the at least one remote management processor;

in response to the request, receiving from the IP issuing computer, at the at least one remote management processor, an acknowledgement packet which includes the requested IP address assigned to the at least one remote management processor and the Option data;

in response to receiving the acknowledgment packet, executing a local code in the at least one remote management processor such that the local code searches the acknowledgement packet to detect the Option data, and storing in the remote management processor, as a destination address for sending an alert packet, the received IP address of the management server included in the Option data; and

in response to the detecting of the Option data, automatically sending the alert packet to the destination address by the at least one remote management processor, such that the alert packet includes the received requested IP address of the at least one remote management processor.

Therefore, amended claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over Komaki and Spearman, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 12 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16

Regarding dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 1, 7 or 12, they include all of the features of the independent claim from which they respectively depend, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding amended claims 1, 7 and 12, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Komaki or Spearman, separately or in combination, of all of the features of these dependent claims.

Furthermore, each of these dependent claims include features that are in addition to those features recited in the respective amended independent claim from which they each depend, which additional features are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Komaki or Spearman, separately or in combination.

Therefore, for all the above reasons, dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16 are patentably distinguishable over Komaki and Spearman, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these dependent claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16 is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/689,432
Docket No.: RPS92003021US1
Reply to the Office Action of November 26, 2008

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,

DILLON & YUDELL, LLP

Dated: February 2, 2009
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759
Telephone: (512) 343-6116

By: /Joseph W. King/
Joseph W. King
Registration No. 35, 768